

**REMARKS**

Claim 1 has been amended responsive to the claim objection set forth in the Office action.

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected on the grounds of obviousness-type double patenting. This Response is accompanied by a terminal disclaimer that is believed to overcome the rejection.

Claim 3 was allowed.

It is therefore believed that claims 1-3 are all allowable. Reconsideration and passage of the application to issue are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Sid Chaudhuri et al

By. 

Ronald D. Slusky  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 26,585  
212-246-4546

Office of Ronald D. Slusky  
Registered Patent Attorney  
353 West 56<sup>th</sup> Street—Suite 5L  
New York, New York 10019-3775  
Date: 10/27/2004